(*b*) Increments to certain officials could not be sanctioned due to the following reasons:

(*a*) Non-fixation of pay in the revised scales of pay;
(*b*) Non-discharge of duties properly;
(*c*) Availment of leave without competent sanction;
(*d*) Maternity leave;
(*e*) Being under suspension from service;
(*f*) Incomplete Service Registers.

(Nobody stood up to put supplementaries.)

Mr. SPEAKER.—No supplementaries? Whoever wanted me to put the Question if there are no supplementaries? Question hour is over.

OBSERVATIONS OF THE SPEAKER *Re*: THE WALKOUT BY SOME MEMBERS AGAINST THE DECISION OF THE CHAIR AND ALSO *Re*: THE SCOPE OF THE APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Before I proceed with the other work, I wish to deal with one or two matters. On the 27th, when I was away from here, certain things happened. I perused the proceedings. There appears to be a colossal confusion, I cannot put a better word, with regard to the resolution moved by the Hon'ble Minister for Home, and accepted by the House and referred to the committee. And there is also a slight confusion with regard to the motion for adjournment for discussion of certain urgent public affairs, which had been disallowed. When once the motion is disallowed, how far it could be a subject matter of protest, discussion and all sorts of things that happend on the 27th instant, has to be considered I will first deal with the grievances mentioned about the committee that has been constituted. I find Sri Sivappa mentioning that under what rule this committee was constituted and if that can be done under no rule, why should not his Adjournment Motion, disallowed by the Speaker, be permitted to be raised before the House. I find a series of members trying to support it. I find one particular member Mr. C. J. Muckannappa referring to the Adjournment Motion saying—"Sir, two days back the Hon'ble Speaker permited the Leader of the Opposition to intervene in the Debate on Miscellaneous Demands, and raise this issue, though it was not a proper occasion". I do not know why the member feels that it was not a proper occasion.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA (Sira).—That was the objection raised by the other members and that was why I repeated it.

Mr. SPEAKER.—It looks as if the member has said this as his opinion. Why does he commit such mistakes? When I read it, I could not make out and I wanted to clarify his mind. Now it is allright. In the course of the Debate on the Budget, every latitude is given as far as possible. On the particular day, one of the Demands was 'Miscellaneous'. Government's conduct on any subject could be

(MR. SPEAKER)

brought under the head 'Miscellaneous'. And, when the Leader of the Opposition met me mentioning that he was going to move an Adjournment Motion, I told him: "I do not know how far it can be brought under the head of Adjournment Motion; anyhow, this Debate is going on and it is not for me to suggest. I am only throwing out an idea; Members need not take it as a request from me. But, I am mentioning this because I have to guide them as far as possible." So, he did introduce an Adjournment Motion and it was disallowed. Even if he had not asked me, the Adjournment Motion would have been disallowed. What is the subject matter covering it? It is of supreme importance, no doubt. But, how is it to be brought out before the House? There are certain principles to bring the Adjournment Motion before the House.

Speaker Mavlankar has laid down the test of urgency in the following words:

2-00 P.M.

"The test of urgency visualised in respect of adjournment motions is being expressed in the old dictum of Mr. Speaker Peel in the House of Commons. He said: 'What I think was contemplated was the occurrence of some sudden emergency, either in home or foreign affairs.' The crucial test always is as to whether the question proposed to be raised has arisen suddenly and created an emergent situation of such a character that there is a *prima facie* case of urgency and the House must therefore leave aside all other business and take up the consideration of the urgent matter at the appointed hour. The urgency must be of such a character that the matter really brooks no delay and should be discussed on the same day that notice has been given."

If some citizen of the State has commited suicide under most distressing circumstances, can it be that the debate on Budget should be suspended and Budget can be done after the 31st of March and this matter could not wait till the Budget is over or is it of such general importance that the Speaker is not right in not admitting it? I will refer to one or two matters. In the following rulings the matter on which adjournment motions were based were not held te be of public importance:

Motion to discuss the Delhi Tongawalas Strike to protest against the alleged failure of the Government to supply gram to them was disallowed as the matter was not 'of such importance as to warrant an adjournment of the House'.

Motion to discuss the prohibition of cane-crushing by the use of kolhus in certain of the Uttar Pradesh. Consent was refused as the matter was' not of an all India importance or even urgency.'

Two motions to discuss the situation arising out of rioting near Civil Court and the tension in City of Delhi respectively were disallowed

on the ground 'the subject of the motion is not an abnormal one but a normal incident in the life of the country which is so vast and so wide.'

There are various other motions which have been disallowed. Mavlankar has explained how importance is judged.

"The only question, to my mind, is as to whether such rioting or tension as is stated to have taken place is a fit subject, looking at the background and the nature of the business before the House, to take notice of in the form of an adjournment motion. I am not therefore inclined to treat this as a matter of public importance from that point of view. Of course the matter of importance is always a relative question and we have to look at the importance of an incident like that in the background of the entire administration of the country. I am not inclined to give my consent to this motion on this sole ground.

I am making the position very clear. Whatever that is said here is not only said here but is carried to other places. It looks as if that a suicide due to recalcitrant conduct of one of the servants of the Government was not permitted to be discussed in the house is a thing which a lay man may not primarily understand. Members must be aware of the intricacies of the rules and they do know and if they do not know, they must aquaint themselves with the rules. Therefore, suicide however grave, however tragic it may be, it cannot be allowed in the form of an adjournment motion.

Now, the question is as to whether the tragic incident is one which would have compelled the Speaker to say: 'let all other business be pushed aside'. Suppose, the Speaker disallows; what will happen? Is it what happened on the 27th? I have read the whole thing and all the remarks of Hon'ble Members. Are they to make these remarks at a time when I am not here? Of course, it is not the fault of Member if I am not here. I have suggested that there was the Demand "Miscellaneous" and Sri Sivappa took that occasion and I am aware that the Government has not replied.

ಶ್ರೀ ಜಿ. ಮರುಳಪ್ಪ (ಕಡೂರು).—ಏನು ತೀರ್ಮಾನ ಕೊಡುತ್ತೀರೋ ಎನ್ನುವ ಭಯ ಸ್ವಾಮಿ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಆ ತರಹ ಭಯಕ್ಕೆ ಕಾರಣವಿಲ್ಲ. ಕಾಡಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಹುಲಿ ಇದೆ ಎಂದು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಗುಡುಗಿದರೆ ಏನು ಮಾಡುವುದು! ನಿಮಗೂ ಹುಲಿಗೂ ಬಹಳ ದೂರವಿದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಕೆ. ಪುಟ್ಟಯ್ಯ (ಮೈಸೂರು).—26 ನೇ ತಾರೀಖಿಗೆ ಮುಂಚೆ ಆ ಭಯವಿರಲಿಲ್ಲ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಅವರವರ ಮನೋಭಾವದ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಇರುತ್ತದೆ. ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಏನು ಮಾಡಲಿಕ್ಕೆ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ? ಆ ಮನೋಭಾವಕ್ಕೆ ಬೇಕಾದ ಮದ್ದು ಅವರವರೇ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು. ನಿಮಗೆ ಏನಾದರೂ ಸಂಶಯ ಇದ್ದರೆ ಸಮಾಧಾನ ಹೇಳಲಿಕ್ಕೆ ಪ್ರಯತ್ನ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಸಮಾಧಾನ ಬಾದರೆ ಸಮಾಧಾನಪಟ್ಟುಕೊಳ್ಳಿ, ಇಲ್ಲದೆ ಹೋದರೆ ನಾನು ಏನು ಮಾಡಲಿಕ್ಕೆ ಆಗುತ್ತದೆ.?

Then, remarks have been made here that the previous resolution was allowed and under what rules are they to bring this and how they should bring it should be told. Is that argument? It only shows that the Members have not seen the necessary Rules, Procedures and Rulings. They raised all this when the Deputy Speaker was presiding as if he had come prepared to answer all these questions.

(MR. SPEAKER)

Now, I will deal with the other question, *i. e.*, the introduction of a Reslution moved by the Home Minister. It was mentioned on that day itself, under what rule it was brought? I have dealt with it. The minds still persist to think that there are no rules and something wrong has been done. Are the public to entertain that idea? And to what purpose? I will refer Hon'ble Members to Rule 135 "Form of the Resolution". What is a resolution or a motion? 'Motion' means any matter which is to be brought before the House for deliberation and discussion. This is May's Parliamentary Practice, latest Edition on page 393.

> "The term 'motion' which in its wide sense means any proposal made for the purpose of eliciting a decision of the House, covers several disctinct forms of proceeding."

Can anybody say that this is not a matter which is not to be considered by the House or not on the ground of jurisdiction. The rules for admissibility are enunciated in the Rules of Procedure. These rules do not preclude me from allowing it. Even then it was said "where are the rules? Please read rule 325 :

> "All matters not specifically provided for in these rules and all questions relating to the detailed working of these rules shall be regulated in such manner as the Speaker may from time to time direct."

Still Members say that there are no rules!

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—Sir, he has to make a request to the Speaker to suspend the rules and the Speaker has to permit him to raise the issue.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Which is the rule? If a rule is to be suspended on a request, there must be a positive rule. If there are no rules, where is the scope suspension?

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—That is what I wanted to know from the Hon'ble Speaker. You were pleased to observe that it was absurd and that is why we kept quiet. We thought that absurdity might be on our part and we thought it better to think it over. When such a contingency arises what is the procedure to be followed? Either the Speaker has to take the law into his own hands or there must be some rule.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I suppose the Hon'ble Member is satisfied that the Resolution is one which is within the purview of the House to debate. Then, comes the question whether there is any rule? Confusion was made by saying that it is a privilege motion and therefore it should have been brought under a particular rule. To some extent, perhaps, that argument was supported by the nothing on the agenda paper, but I made the position clear much earlier than that. Whether it is contempt, gross disorderly conduct on the part of a member — all these things are to be

considered. All these things may not come within the purview of a Privilege Committee and therefore they cannot go to a Privilege Committee. Therefore, a special committee was suggested to be constituted. Therefore, there is nothing that is wrong. If there is a positive rule, follow it; it is binding on the House and on me till it is changed. The Hon'ble Member says that I am invoking the power under the residuary rule.

Sri G. V. GOWDA (Palya).—We did not know under what rule the Home Minister moved the motion.

Mr. SPEAKER.—It is no fault of his. Please refer to rule 135.

Sri G. V. GOWDA.—Rule 135 applies to the acts of commission and omission by Government,

Mr. SPEAKER.—If the member continues to think like that, he is at liberty to do so. The Hon'ble Member is thinking that only the conduct of Government can be brought under Resolutions.

Sri G. V. GOWDA.—That is specifically mentioned in rule 135. It is not the act or policy of Government which is now sought to be condemned.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Chapters XV and XVI deal with Resolutions and Motions and I request the Member to kindly read them and then come to me and I am prepared to give one day for discussion on any day that suits the Members. I do not want the Members to say that it has been done in a most high-handed manner.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—Regarding the adjournment motion, your predecessor has permitted this House.....

Mr. SPEAKER.—I counsel patience. I am doing this so that Members may exercise their rights to the fullest extent possible. To-day the Appropriation Bill will come up before the House and it may be possible to bring that matter under the Appropriation Bill. I am prepared to allow some time because there was no reply to that from the Government.

Sri G. V. GOWDA.—It may be possibly to bring it under the Appropriation Bill, but what was canvassed was something different. You rightly pointed out, Sir, that all kinds of suicides cannot warrant a discussion here, but the circumstances under which a particular suicide was committed is a matter of importance.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—Your predecessor was pleased to allow one full day for the discussion of Muniamma's case. At that time, a point was raised by the then Member Sri K. Hanumanthiah that it would amount to *sub judice*. Then, the Advocate General was summoned to ascertain whether it would amount to *sub judice*. The circumstances under which this suicide was committe has forced Sri S. Sivappa to table an adjournment motion. You yourself who was then the Law Minister took about an hour on that matter.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಲಕ್ಕಪ್ಪ (ಹೆಬ್ಬೂರು).—ಈ ರೂಲಿಗೆ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ತರಬೇಕೆಂದು ನಾವು ಪ್ರಯತ್ನಪಟ್ಟೆವು. ಆದರೆ ಎರ್ಲಾ ಪವರ್ಸ್ ತಮ್ಮ ಕೈಲೇ ಇದೆ. ಈಗ ಆಗಿರತಕ್ಕ ಅನ್ಯಾಯವನ್ನು ಮನಸ್ಸಿಗೆ ತಂದುಕೊಂಡರೆ ಬಹಳ ನೋವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಮುಖ್ಯವಾಗಿ ದೇಶಕ್ಕೆ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದಾಗಲೆ ಎಂಬುದೇ ನಮ್ಮ ಉದ್ದೇಶ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Order, order. I am not allowing.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಲಕ್ಕಪ್ಪ.—ವಿವರಣೆಯನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಕೊಡುತ್ತಾರೆಂದು ತಾವು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದೀರಿ ತಮಗೂ ಶ್ರೀವಾತ್ ಚನ್ನಯ್ಯನವರು ಒಂದು ಕಾಗದವನ್ನು ಬರೆದಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರ ನನಗೆ ತಾವು ಮಾತನಾಡಲು ಅಪ್ಪಣೆ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I am not giving permission.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಲಕ್ಕಪ್ಪ.—ನನಗೆ ಆ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ವಿವರಣೆ ಕೊಡಲು ತಾವು ದಯವಿಟ್ಟು ಅಪ್ಪಣೆ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Order, order. I really do not understand. When I say 'Order, order' thrice, still the member go on talking, thinking that I will keep quiet. This is a very bad habet. I won't tole. Rate it on the part of anybody. You want to say that the copy of a communication said to have been addressed to others... ..but is that the way to do so ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಲಕ್ಕಪ್ಪ.—ನಾನು ಕೇಳುತ್ತಿರುವುದು ಅಪ್ಪಣೆ ಕೊಡಿ ಎಂದು,,.....

Mr. SPEAKER.—I am not giving this Hon'ble Member permission. The Hon'ble Member Sri Muckannappa says that there is a precedent and that this is not a new thing. Before considering the precedent, each set of fact has to be judged.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—I tried my best to bring it to your notice before you concluded.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Now, the member has got a chance to say what he want. I do not know whether at that time the circumstances were similar and whether there was the Budget Debate going on and whether it could have been brought under that Debate and so on.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—Budget debate was not going on at that time.

Mr. SPEAKER.—That makes all the difference in allowing the motion. Whether there was chance to debate or not and whether there was a possibility of raising the matter or not, was one of the primary considerations.

Sri S. M. KRISHNA (Maddur).—You want the Appropriation Bill to be passed in 10 or 20 minutes and you say that it can be discussed in the debate on the Appropriation Bill. How is it possible to discuss this in 15 or 20 minutes ?

Mr. SPEAKER.—If members do not want this opportunity, I am not particular. I go to the next item on the agenda. I have got the recommendation of the Governor with regard to the Appropriation Bill. Let no member think that there is no recommendation from the Governor.

MYSORE APPROPRIATION (No. 4) BILL, 1965—INTRODUCTION.

Motion to introduce.

Sri B. D. JATTI (Minister for Finance).—I beg to introduce the Mysore Appropriation (No. 4) Bill, 1965.